

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/676,621

**Applicant(s)**

MODI, MANOJ

**Examiner**

Susan Y. Chen

**Art Unit**

2161

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susan Y. Chen.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Robert D. Atkins.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 16 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,9 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: AAPA.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner points out the following defects in the claims: 1) the use of phrase "is sufficient" in evaluating a total value of the set of real properties is indefinite; 2) the use of "substantially similar types" in claim 9 is unclear; 3) the dependency of claim 18 is incorrect, because it depends on canceled claim 17. Furthermore, the examiner indicates if claim 1 is amended it may be allowable. The attorney indicated that he will amend the claims to resolve the issues raised by the examiner and clearly recite the novelty of instant invention in the claims.